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Search Strategy

Identification
Cochrane, Medline, CINAHL, and National Guideline Clearing House were searched

Screening
Titles and Abstracts of each study were reviewed. Bibliographies of major reviews or meta-analyses were searched for additional relevant articles.

Eligibility
Excluded articles: Non-English, Commentaries, Case-Studies, Narratives, Book Chapters, Editorials, Non-systematic Reviews (scoping reviews), and conference abstracts.

Included
Included Articles: English language articles, RCTs, observational studies and systematic reviews/meta-analysis. Relevant guidelines addressing the topic were also included.

Included Articles: A total of 11 Articles and 5 Guidelines

Cochrane, Medline, CINAHL, and National Guideline Clearing House were search using the terms (“Stroke” and “end-of-life” or “advanced care planning”). Titles and abstract of each article were reviewed for relevance. Bibliographies were reviewed to find additional relevant articles. Articles were excluded if they were: non-English, commentaries, case-studies, narrative, book chapters, editorials, non-systematic review, or conference abstracts. Additional searches for relevant best practice guidelines were completed and included in a separate section of the review. A total of 11 articles and 5 guidelines were included and were separated into separate categories designed to answer specific questions.
### Published Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Nurses in collaboration with the interprofessional team will assess and support clients (family/substitute decision maker [SDM]) to make informed decisions that are consistent with their beliefs, values and preferences to ensure client wishes are known and incorporated into the plan of care (includes advanced, palliative and end of life care planning).

(Level of Evidence = IV)


Develop and implement an interdisciplinary treatment plan that treats stroke complications.

When the assessment identifies complications of stroke, implement appropriate curative, restorative, or palliative treatment on the basis of a shared decision that reflects the patient's wishes and treatment goals.


Clinical Highlights

- Health care providers should complete a systematic review and document patients' goals for care and advance directives. (Annotations #4, 10; Aim #6)
- Health care providers play an important role in the grief and bereavement processes by supporting the patient and family throughout the course of illness and following the patient's death. (Annotation #22)

Royal College of Physicians, British Geriatrics Society, Royal College of Nursing, Royal College of Psychiatrists, Royal College of General Practitioners, British Society of Rehabilitation Medicine, Alzheimer's Society, Help the Aged and the National Council for Palliative Care. Advance care planning. RCP Concise Guidance for Good Practice No. 12. February 2009.

Detailed recommendations were made within the following categories:

- When and with whom should I be considering ACP discussions?
- The discussion
- Will ACP work?
- Individuals with progressive cognitive impairment
- Recommendations for training and implementation of ACP
**Domain 1: Structure and Processes of Care**

**Guideline 1.1** The timely plan of care is based on a comprehensive interdisciplinary assessment of the patient and family.

**Guideline 1.2** The care plan is based on the identified and expressed preferences, values, goals, and needs of patient and family and is developed with professional guidance and support for decision making.

**Guideline 1.3** An interdisciplinary team provides services to the patient and family consistent with the care plan. In addition to nursing, medicine, and social work, other therapeutic disciplines with important assessment of patients and families include physical therapists, occupational therapists, speech and language pathologists, nutritionists, psychologists, chaplains, and nursing assistants. For pediatrics, this should include child-life specialists. Complementary and alternative therapies may be included.

**Guideline 1.4** The use of appropriately trained and supervised volunteers within the interdisciplinary team is strongly encouraged.

**Guideline 1.5** Support for education and training is available to the interdisciplinary team.

**Guideline 1.6** In its commitment to quality assessment and performance improvement, the palliative care program develops, implements, and maintains an ongoing data driven process that reflects the complexity of the organization and focuses on palliative care outcomes.

**Guideline 1.7** The palliative care program recognizes the emotional impact on the palliative care team of providing care to patients with life-threatening illnesses and their families.

**Guideline 1.8** Palliative care programs should have a relationship with one or more hospices and other community resources in order to ensure continuity of the highest-quality palliative care across the illness trajectory.

**Guideline 1.9** The physical environment in which care is provided should meet the preferences, needs, and circumstances of the patient and family to the extent possible.

**Domain 2: Physical Aspects of Care**

**Guideline 2.1** Pain, other symptoms, and side effects are managed based upon the best available evidence, with attention to disease-specific pain and symptoms, which is skillfully and systematically applied.

**Domain 3: Psychological and Psychiatric Aspects of Care**

**Guideline 3.1** Psychological status is assessed and managed based upon the best available evidence, which is skillfully and systematically applied. When necessary, psychiatric issues are addressed and treated.

**Guideline 3.2** A grief and bereavement program is available to patients and families, based on the assessed need for services.

**Domain 4: Social Aspects of Care**

**Guideline 4.1** Comprehensive interdisciplinary assessment identifies the social needs of patients and their families, and a care plan is developed to respond to these needs as effectively as possible.

**Domain 5: Spiritual, Religious and Existential Aspects of Care**

**Guideline 5.1** Spiritual and existential dimensions are assessed and responded to based upon the best available evidence.
### Domain 6: Cultural Aspects of Care

**Guideline 6.1** The palliative care program assesses and attempts to meet the needs of the patient, family, and community in a culturally sensitive manner.

### Domain 7: Care of the Imminently Dying Patient

**Guideline 7.1** Signs and symptoms of impending death are recognized and communicated in developmentally appropriate language for children and patients with cognitive disabilities with respect to family preferences. Care appropriate for this phase of illness is provided to patient and family.

**Guideline 7.2** Postdeath care is delivered in a respectful manner. Cultural and religious practices particular to the postdeath period are assessed and documented. Care of the body postdeath is delivered with respect to these practices, as well as in accordance to both organizational practice and local law.

**Guideline 7.3** A postdeath bereavement plan is activated. An interdisciplinary team member is assigned to the family in the postdeath period to help with religious practices, funeral arrangements, and burial planning.

### Domain 8: Ethical and Legal Aspects of Care

**Guideline 8.1** The patient's goals, preferences and choices are respected within the limits of applicable state and federal law, within current accepted standards of medical care, and form the basis for the plan of care.

**Guideline 8.2** The palliative care program is aware of and addresses the complex ethical issues arising in the care of persons with life-threatening debilitating illness.

**Guideline 8.3** The palliative care program is knowledgeable about legal and regulatory aspects of palliative care.
## Evidence Table

### Knowledge of Advance Care Planning Among the General Public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Type</th>
<th>Quality Rating</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Key Findings and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teixeira et al. 2015     | NA             | 1,021 Canadians, aged ≥18 years, randomly sampled from the general population. 48% were male, a plurality of participants was aged 45-54 years (33%) and were from Ontario (32%) | 5 questions related to advance care planning (ACP) were posed using a short online survey: 1) had they ever heard of the term ‘ACP’; 2) had they ever had a discussion with a family or friend or 3) a healthcare provider regarding healthcare treatments’ preferences in the event that they would become too ill or too injured to speak for themselves; 4) had they written an ACP; and 5) if they had designated a person to be their healthcare decision maker in the event of incapacity. Associations between knowledge of ACP and 6 variables was also examined (age, sex, education, income, children living in household, born in Canada) | Number of participants familiar with aspects of ACP | 160 participants (16%) were familiar with the term ACP  
530 participants (52%) had discussions with friends and family members regarding ACP  
105 participants (10%) had discussions with healthcare professionals regarding ACP  
204 participants (20%) had written an ACP  
479 participants (47%) has a substitute decision maker.  
Increasing age was the only factor that was associated all 5 ACP outcomes. |
## Advance Care Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Type</th>
<th>Quality Rating</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Key Findings and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green et al. 2014</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14 patients ≥18 years, recruited from an acute stroke unit and 2 rehabilitation units ≤12 weeks previously; and 4 healthcare professionals (HCP) (3 nurses and 1 social worker). Patients with aphasia and cognitive impairment, were excluded.</td>
<td>Participant observation and semi-structured interviews were used to gather information related to the communication processes regarding advance care planning between patients and HCPs, using grounded theory methodology.</td>
<td>Key themes related to why/why not participants engaged in the ACP process.</td>
<td>1. Lack of perceived urgency by participants about the need for ACP, many of whom felt the physician and/or family members would make decisions in accordance with their wishes; another aspect was the patients' lack of information from HCPs regarding the severity of their stroke. In the rehabilitation phase, the focus was recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qureshi et al. 2013</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>28 patients who were admitted to a comprehensive stroke study over a 12-month period with ischemic stroke or ICH and those with advanced care directives at the time of admission</td>
<td>A total of 28 treatment decision items were selected and categorized in three groups of decision making according to complexity and risk: i) routine complexity which included interventions that are done routinely and did not require informed consent (e.g., fever or hyperglycemia management); ii) moderate complexity that did not always require informed, but did require some discussion with family members (e.g., moderate complexity that did not always require informed consent); iii) high complexity which required treatment decisions that require informed consent and family discussions.</td>
<td>The proportion of treatment withheld and the percentage agreement to treat per patient for each of the items.</td>
<td>2. Lack of initiation by HCPs to discuss issues around ACP. 3. HCPs expressed hesitation about initiating discussions related to ACP, and uncertainty as the best timing for such discussions. There was also a lack of awareness as to what ACP is, and thought it was outside their scope of practice. 4. Confusing ACP with advance directives, designation of care and living wills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In routine complexity treatment decisions, the percentage agreement among raters as to whether to offer a specific treatment varied from 75%-100% in the presence of ACD and 78%-100% in their absence. In moderate complexity treatment decisions, the percentage agreement among raters as to whether to offer a specific treatment varied from 68%-79% in the presence of ACD and 67%-86% in their absence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Type</th>
<th>Quality Rating</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Key Findings and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heyland et al. 2013 Canada Prospective Study</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>278 patients with advanced pulmonary, cardiac, or liver disease, metastatic cancer, were ≥80 years of age and admitted for an acute condition, or were not expected to survive 6 months. 225 family members of patients meeting the above criteria were also included.</td>
<td>Participating patients and family members were interviewed 2-5 days following admission. Medical records were reviewed immediately following the interview to identify any documentation of issues related to end-of-life care.</td>
<td>Selected domains from the Canadian Health Care Evaluation Project (CANHELP) Questionnaire.</td>
<td>In high-complexity treatment decisions, the percentage agreement among raters as to whether to offer a specific treatment varied from 74%-80% in the presence of ACD and 71%-85% in their absence. Treatment decisions were not influenced by the presence of ACDs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thrombolytic therapy or institution of intubation and mechanical ventilation); and ii) high complexity, requiring informed consent (e.g., craniectomy or hematoma evacuation).

A summary of each patient's case, including a copy of the patient's advanced healthcare directives (ACD) were reviewed and rated independently by 6 stroke physicians. Each rater indicated that they would or would not offer a therapeutic option. The review was performed twice by each rater one month apart, once with knowledge of the ACP and once without.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Type</th>
<th>Quality Rating</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Key Findings and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearlman et al. 2000 USA Prospective study</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>A convenience sample of 342 participants from 7 groups (younger and older well adults; persons with chronic illness, terminal cancer, AIDS; stroke survivors with residual impairments (n=45); and nursing home residents.</td>
<td>Treatment preferences (antibiotics, long-term mechanical ventilation (with tracheostomy), long-term hemodialysis, long-term jejunual tube feeding, short-term mechanical ventilation, and CPR) and health status data (functional status, depression, and personal experience with mechanical ventilation, CPR, dialysis, coma, severe memory loss, and paralysis) were collected during in person interviews. Responses were elicited for each participant's current health state and three hypothetical health states representing severe dementia, permanent coma, and severe stroke. A 6-point summary scale was developed (0-6) as an indicator of a patient's willingness to accept all 6 treatments. Lower scores indicated greater likelihood to accept treatment.</td>
<td>% of participants willingness to accept/forgo the 6 treatments (antibiotics, short-term ventilation, CPR, long-term dialysis, long-term tube feeding and long-term mechanical ventilation). Summary scores.</td>
<td>Overall, participants chose to forego invasive or long-term treatments more often than less invasive, short-term treatments, and chose to forego treatments more often in seriously impaired health states (coma, and to a lesser extent severe dementia and severe stroke) than they did in their current health state. For the sub group of stroke survivors: Current health state: the percentage of participants who chose to forgo the 6 treatments ranged from 5% (antibiotics) to 60% (long-term mechanical ventilation) Severe stroke: in this scenario, the percentage of participants who chose to forgo the 6 treatments ranged from 30% (antibiotics) to 80% (long-term mechanical ventilation) Permanent coma: this health state was associated with the highest percentages of persons choosing to forgo treatment, ranging from 60% (antibiotics) to 80% (long-term mechanical ventilation). Summary scores for the different health states were; 1.9 (current health), 3.5 (severe stroke), 2.9 (severe dementia) and 4.3 (permanent coma)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Interventions Associated with Advance Care Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Type</th>
<th>Quality Rating</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Key Findings and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kirchhoff et al. 2012</strong>&lt;br&gt;US RCT</td>
<td>CA: ☑&lt;br&gt;Blinding: Patient ☑&lt;br&gt;Therapist ☑&lt;br&gt;Assessor ☑&lt;br&gt;ITT: ☐</td>
<td>313 patients (and their surrogate decision makers) with congestive heart failure or end-stage renal disease who were expected to experience serious complication or death within 2 years.</td>
<td>Participants and their surrogates were randomized to receive a patient-centered advance care planning intervention (n=160) or care as usual (n=153). The intervention involved a 60-90-minute interview with a trained facilitator that involved discussion of disease-specific end-of-life care issues and options. The facilitator also assisted in documenting treatment preferences.</td>
<td>The Statement of Treatment Preferences (STP) was used to document patient preferences. For patients who died during the study period, telephone interviews with surrogates and medical records were used to identify end-of-life care received.</td>
<td>Of the 313 patients enrolled in the study, 110 died within the study period. 26% of these individuals required a surrogate decision maker at the end-of-life. 1 patient in the intervention group and 3 in the control group received care at the end-of-life that was contrary to their wishes for reasons other than medical futility. With respect to resuscitation preferences, fewer patients in the intervention group received care that was contrary to their wishes (1/62) than patients in the usual care group (6/48); however, between group comparisons were not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detering et al. 2010</strong>&lt;br&gt;Australia RCT</td>
<td>CA: ☑&lt;br&gt;Blinding: Patient ☑&lt;br&gt;Therapist ☑&lt;br&gt;Assessor ☑&lt;br&gt;ITT: ☑</td>
<td>309 patients’ ≥ 80 years of age who were admitted to internal medicine, cardiology, or respiratory medicine. Patients who were not competent, who had an existing advance care plan, or who were expected to die or be discharged within 24 hours were excluded. 35.5% of those assessed were eligible for inclusion</td>
<td>Participants were randomized to receive formal advance care planning from a trained facilitator (n=154) or care as usual (n=155). The intervention was based on the Respecting Patient Choices model which involves reflection on goals, values, and beliefs, documentation of future health care wishes, and appointment of a surrogate decision maker. Participants in the control group only received advance care planning if it was specifically requested.</td>
<td><strong>Primary Outcome:</strong> The proportion of deceased participants whose end-of-life wishes were respected. <strong>Secondary Outcomes:</strong> Patient satisfaction of hospital stay (5-item survey) and the impact of death on a surviving family member (Impact of Events Scale and Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale). Assessments were conducted 3 and 6 months after enrollment. For those who died during the 6-month study period, a final follow-up was conducted with a family member 3 month following the death.</td>
<td>Of the 154 participants randomized to the intervention group, 108 completed a formal advance care plan, including end-of-life health care wishes and/or appointment of a surrogate. By the end of the study period, 56 participants were deceased (29 in the intervention group and 27 in the control group). Of those who died, end-of life wishes were significantly more likely to be known and respected for participants in the intervention group as compared to those in the control group (86% vs. 30%, p&lt;0.01). Following the death of a relative, family members of those in the intervention group reported significantly less anxiety and depression and more satisfaction with the quality of their relative’s death, as compared to control group family members (all at p&lt;0.05).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Advance Care Planning

#### Study/Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Type</th>
<th>Quality Rating</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Key Findings and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grimaldo et al. 2001</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 200 elective surgery patients’ ≥65 years of age attending an anesthesia preoperative evaluation clinic. 65% of eligible patients agreed to participate in the study.</td>
<td>Participants were randomized to receive the advance care planning intervention (n=99) or care as usual (n=99). The intervention consisted of a single 5-10-minute information session focusing on issues such as designation of surrogate decision-makers and end-of-life care.</td>
<td>Outcomes included a questionnaire (with items concerning advance care planning, quality of communication, and treatment preferences) and the SF-36. Assessments were conducted before and after the intervention.</td>
<td>Preoperatively, 70% of participants in the intervention group and 61% of participants in the control group had discussed end-of-life care wishes with a family member. Post-operatively, an additional 15% of those who had received the intervention reported having discussed end-of-life care with a loved one, as compared to an additional 8% in the control group (p&lt;0.05). Drop outs: 10 in the intervention group and 3 in the control group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flatharta et al. 2015</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>- 121 inpatients and outpatients attending geriatric and stroke services at a single hospital with at least one stroke risk factor. Patients who would not be candidates for thrombolysis treatment in a real-life situation, were excluded.</td>
<td>Two scenarios for potential treatment with t-PA were presented: presentation within 3 hours and 3-4.5 hours of symptom onset. Risks and benefits of treatment were explained. Participants were asked to decide whether they would decide to have or not have the treatment if they were faced with the decision in real life. Participants were also asked if they would like for their choice to be documented in their medical notes (instead of</td>
<td>Proportion of patients opting for treatment in both scenarios.</td>
<td>108 participants (89.3%) opted to receive thrombolysis within 3 hours. 100 participants (82.6%) opted to receive thrombolysis within 3-4.5 hours. 98 participants (81.0%) opted to receive thrombolysis in both scenarios. 11 participants (9.1%) opted not to receive thrombolysis in either scenario. Participants who agreed to treatment were more likely to have had a previous stroke or TIA and were more likely to want their decision documented in their medical chart. The majority of participants indicated that the doctor should decide whether they should receive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Advanced Directives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Type</th>
<th>Quality Rating</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Key Findings and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liu et al. 2017</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>206 patients with neurological conditions referred to a palliative care service at a single institution from 2010-2014. Mean age was 70 years, 54% were women.</td>
<td>Chart review examining symptoms, prognosis, goals of care, discharge planning, and advance directives</td>
<td>Secondary outcome: Number of patients with advanced directives in place.</td>
<td>72% of patients were unable to communicate at the time of consultation. The diagnosis of 49% of patients referred to the service was stroke. 61 patients (30%) had advanced directives in place at the time of admission to hospital, including a living will (7%) medical durable power of attorney (4%) while 19% had both a living will and MDPOA. At the time of palliative care consultation, 130 patients (63%) had advanced directives, which increased to 190 (92%) after consolation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silveira et al. 2010</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3,476 persons aged ≥60 years included in the Health and Retirement Study who died between 2000-2006, for whom a proxy had completed an exit interview after the</td>
<td>Data was collected regarding whether the subject had completed a living will or durable power of attorney (DPOA) for health care, maintained decision-making</td>
<td>Need for proxy end-of-life decision making and concordance of preferences in advanced directives with care received.</td>
<td>25.6% of decedents had cerebrovascular disease at the time of death. Most proxy respondents were adult children or spouses. 70.3% of decedents who required decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study/Type</td>
<td>Quality Rating</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Key Findings and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participant’s death, within 24 months. Mean age at death was 80.5 year, 53% were female.</td>
<td></td>
<td>making capacity, or needed decision making at the end of life. For subjects who needed decision making, data were collected on the decisions made and on the person who made them. Predictors of and preferences for all care possible, limited care and comfort care, were examined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in the last few days of life, lacked decision-making capacity. Among them, 67.5% had an advance directive, 6.8% had a living will only, 21.3% had appointed a DPOA for medical decision-making and 39.4% had prepared both a living will and appointed a DPOA for healthcare decisions. Living wills and DPOA were completed a median of 20 and 19 months prior to death, respectively. Among decedents who had living wills, 1.9% had requested all care possible, 92.7% had requested limited care, and 96.2% had requested comfort care. 83.2% of decedents who requested limited care and 97.1% who requested comfort care received care consistent with their preferences. Incapacitated subjects who had prepared a living will (regardless of preferences) were less likely to receive all treatment possible (adjusted OR= 0.33, 95% CI 0.19 to 0.56) and more likely to receive limited treatment (adjusted OR=1.79, 95% CI, 1.28 to 2.50) than decedents without a living will. Living wills were associated with increased odds of receiving comfort care (adjusted OR=2.59, 95% CI 1.06 to 6.31). Decedents who had assigned a DPOA were less likely to die in a hospital or receive all care possible compared with those who had not assigned a DPOA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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